Case: 3:11-cv-00050-NBB Doc #: 1 Filed: 04/06/11 1 of 7 PageID #: 1

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI WESTERN DIVISION

APR 8 6 2011

DAVID CREVE CLERK

Deputy

LISA CARPENTER MOONEY

**PLAINTIFF** 

**VERSUS** 

NO. 3:11-01-050-11-A

LAFAYETTE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

**DEFENDANT** 

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

#### **COMPLAINT**

This is an action to recover actual damages for violation of First Amendment rights, and for violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. The following facts support this action:

1.

Plaintiff LISA CARPENTER MOONEY is an adult resident citizen of 756 Highway 6 West, Oxford, Mississippi 38655.

2.

Defendant LAFAYETTE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT is a political subdivision of the State of Mississippi, which at all relevant times acted under color of state law. It may be served with process upon its superintendent, W. Michael Foster, Lafayette County School District, 100 Commodore Drive, Oxford, Mississippi 38655.

3.

This Court has federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, and civil rights jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1343, for a cause of action

arising under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991. This action is authorized by 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended.

4.

Plaintiff has filed an EEOC charge, attached hereto as Exhibit "A," the allegations of which are incorporated herein by reference. Plaintiff has also received the right to sue letter, attached hereto as Exhibit "B."

5.

Plaintiff was hired as a speech pathologist by Defendant in August 2001. Plaintiff had an impeccable record, with no complaints about her job performance and much praise about her job performance, from 2001-2006.

6.

In approximately May 2006, elementary school principal Margaret Boyd asked Plaintiff to become assistant principal working under her. This request was made based upon Plaintiff's excellent performance record and Plaintiff's having been selected as Mississippi Speech Language and Hearing Association School Clinician of the Year, and upon Plaintiff's known extensive knowledge of special education. Plaintiff was known as being extremely organized, and a topranked administrator. At that time, there was absolutely no question about Plaintiff's job performance or what an excellent job Plaintiff did.

7.

In 2007, the Superintendent of Education, Mike Foster, was opposed for re-election as superintendent by Carolyn Davis, the SPED Director. During the election campaign, Ben McClung,

Assistant Superintendent of Education, strongly supported the incumbent, Superintendent Mike Foster. Foster and McClung assisted Foster's campaign by distributing requests for teachers to purchase and endorse ads in support of Foster. Plaintiff declined to sign any ad supporting Foster, since Plaintiff believed that Davis was an outstanding educator, and Plaintiff could not in good faith support Foster in the election.

8.

On one occasion, in order to assist Foster's campaign, McClung approached Plaintiff and requested that Plaintiff supply adverse information about Davis to place into Davis' personnel file. Plaintiff informed McClung that such activity would be negative to Davis' personnel file would be inappropriate.

9.

Following Plaintiff's declining to support Foster in the campaign against Davis, a number of adverse actions were taken against Plaintiff, including refusing to give Plaintiff a raise to which she was due because she had received her degree in administration, leaving Plaintiff out of educational meetings; removing various educational materials from Plaintiff's office; and isolating Plaintiff from the educational process.

10.

In May 2009, the principal informed Plaintiff that she was contemplating removing Plaintiff as assistant principal and replacing Plaintiff with a male. Plaintiff protested, and the Defendant ultimately did not replace Plaintiff at that time. However, the principal then claimed a dissatisfaction with Plaintiff's performance, and placed Plaintiff on a performance improvement plan. Before Plaintiff had protested the contemplated removal of her as assistant principal, before Plaintiff had

refused to support Mike Foster in the election campaign and before Plaintiff had refused to assist in putting adverse entries in Davis' personnel file, there had been no complaints about Plaintiff's performance. Following the protected activity and in May 2009, Plaintiff was placed on an improvement plan based upon Defendant's pretextual complaints about Plaintiff's performance, including tardiness, talking too loud, and being too harsh with the students.

11.

Thereafter, as part of the performance plan, Plaintiff was required to "clock in" at school. Plaintiff was the only administrator required to clock in. Although the official start time for school was 7:15 a.m., many administrators and many teachers did not meet that clock-in deadline.

12.

On or about May 5, 2010, Plaintiff was informed that her employment contract would not be renewed based on multiple complaints of poor job performance, including checking in after 7:15 a.m.

13.

One of the reasons given for Plaintiff's non-renewal was the Defendant's claim that it was having a cut-back. However, if there were a legitimate cut-back, Plaintiff would not have been the logical person to be laid off. A male assistant principal, Scott Haley, had substantially less experience in the school district than did Plaintiff.

14.

Plaintiff's loss of her employment was the result of:

A. Plaintiff's exercising her First Amendment rights, by refusing to provide adverse documentation on Carolyn Davis, failure to campaign against Davis for the position of superintendent and failing to sign on in support of Foster; and

B. Plaintiff's exercise of First Amendment rights and Plaintiff's opposition to sex discrimination when Defendant announced a plan to move her from the assistant principal position so that position could be given to a man; and

C. Giving preference to a male in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

15.

Plaintiff has suffered mental anxiety and stress and lost income as a result of Defendant's illegal acts.

16.

Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for actual damages, for lost income, and damages for mental anxiety and stress.

#### REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff requests damages in an amount to be determined by a jury, for reinstatement and reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and expenses.

Respectfully submitted,

WAIDE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

BY:

JIM WAIDE

MIS BAR NO. 6857

WAIDE & ASSOCIATES, P.A. ATTORNEYS AT LAW POST OFFICE BOX 1357 TUPELO, MISSISSIPPI 38802 TELEPHONE: 662-842-7324

FACSIMILE: 662-842-8056 EMAIL: waide@waidelaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Case: 3:11-	cv-06050-NBB Doc #: 1 Fil	led: 04/06/11/16 of	7 PageID #charg	GE NUMBER
. , ,		Alomate I	3.2 //	
CHARGE OF DIS	CRIMINATION			
This form is affected by the Privacy A Statement before completing this form.	ct of 1974; See Privacy Act		490-2	010-01968
				and EEOC
	State or local Agency,			
NAME(Indicate Mr., Ms., Mrs.) LISA CARPENTER MOONEY		HOME TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 662-236-2730		
STREET ADDRESS CIT		B	DATE OF BIRTH	
756 Highway 6 West On			4/12/74	
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER, LABOR ORGA AGENCY WHO DISCRIMINATED AGAINST	NIZATION, EMPLOYMENT AGENCY, ME (If more than one list	APPRENTICESHIP COMbelow.)		
NAME NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, MEMBERS TELEPHON (Code)				(Include Area
Lafayette County School District				
	I TY, STATE AND ZIP CODE Xford, MS 38655			COUNTY Lafayette
CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON	(Check appropriate box(es))		DATE DISCRIMINATI EARLIEST (ADEA/EI	
RACE COLOR	X SEX RELIGIO	N AGE	May 5, 2010	
	TIONAL DISABILITY	OPPOSITION	Opposition continuing action	
On May 5, 2010, I was informed that I was me and to replace me with a man on a "pai my lack of political support for the super SPED director who ran against the superions. Davis.	is non-renewed for my position as ass	istant principal. The presstrict wanted a man in my	vious year, an effort ha administrative positio	rding Carolyn Davis, the
Additionally, I had been criticized for send	ding my child to a private school.			
I believe my discharge is a combination of child to a private school.	f my sex (female) and my lack of political	tical association and supp	ort for the superintend	ent and of my sending my
I believe I have been discriminated agains	t because of my sex (female) in violati	ion of Title VII of the Civ	il Rights Act of 1967,	as amended.
			SECTION OF	FIVEN
I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or local Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my address or telephone number and I will cooperate fully with them in the processing of my charge in		NOTARY - (When nec	essary ( State and No	ical Requirements 2010
		I swear or affirm that I have	ve read the above charge at	nd that it is true to the best of
accordance with their procedures.  I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.		my knowledge, information and bell of SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT		
1 deciate under penanty of perjury that the foles				
0b. 08.10 Jen		SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS DATE (Day, month, and year)		
	Party ((gnatuje)			
EEOC FORM 5 (Test 10/94)			. 3	





## U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

# NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUE (ISSUED ON REQUEST)

To: Lisa Mooney

Oxford, MS 38655

EEOC Form 161-B (11/09)

From: Memphis District Office

	ighway 6 West d, MS 38655		Suite 9	nion Avenue 01 nis, TN 38104		
	On behalf of person(s) aggriev CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR §16					
EEOC Charge	e No.	EEOC Representat	ive	Telephone No.		
		Michael G. Hol	lis,	•		
490-2010-	01968	Investigator		(901) 544-0146		
			(See also the addi	ional information enclosed with this form.)		
	E PERSON AGGRIEVED:					
Act (GINA): been issued of your rece	This is your Notice of Right to	o Sue, issued under Title ' it under Title VII, the ADA	VII, the ADA or GINA based on GINA must be filed in a f	Senetic Information Nondiscrimination on the above-numbered charge. It has ederal or state court <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u> imit for filing suit based on a claim under		
X	More than 180 days have	passed since the filing of the	his charge.			
	Less than 180 days have public to complete its address.	passed since the filing of the ministrative processing with	his charge, but I have determ hin 180 days from the filing o	ined that it is unlikely that the EEOC will fthis charge.		
X	The EEOC is terminating if	ts processing of this charg	е,	:		
	The EEOC will continue to					
Age Discrin 90 days afte your case:	r you receive notice that we	have completed action on	the charge. In this regard, ti	om 60 days after the charge was filed until ne paragraph marked below applies to		
	The EEOC is closing your 90 DAYS of your receipt	case. Therefore, your law of this Notice. Otherwise	rsuit under the ADEA must be a your right to sue based on	e filed in federal or state court <u>WITHIN</u> the above-numbered charge will be lost.		
	The EEOC is continuing its handling of your ADEA case. However, if 60 days have passed since the filing of the charge, you may file suit in federal or state court under the ADEA at this time.					
in federal or	state court within 2 years (3 y	rears for willful violations) o	EPA (filing an EEOC charge if the alleged EPA underpayme you file suit may not be c	s not required.) EPA suits must be brought ent. This means that backpay due for ollectible.		
lf you file sui	it, based on this charge, pleas	se send a copy of your cou	rt complaint to this office.			
	·		On behalf of the Commission	JAN 1 2 2011		
Enclosures	(s) 0	Ka	therine W. Kores, Director	(Date Mailed)		
	Michael Foster Superintendent LAFAYETTE COUNTY SCH	HOOL DIST.	Jim Waide Attorney P. O. Boxx 13 Tupelo, MS 38			